



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,882	05/23/2001	Takaaki Amano	100809-16256(SCET 18.691)	9462
7590 08/20/2007 KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN 575 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK,, NY 10022-2585			EXAMINER LAstra, DANIEL	
			ART UNIT 3622	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/863,882	AMANO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DANIEL LASTRA	3622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DANIEL LASTRA. (3) _____.

(2) BRIAN E. HENNESSEY. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 16 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Goldhaber (US 5,855,008), Gardenswartz (US 6,055,573), Bachman (US 6,895,386).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner agreed to withdraw the Section 112 rejection and the Examiner acknowledge receipt of the priority documents in the present application. The Applicant argues that the prior arts cited do not teach "wherein the larger the total number of points accumulated by the person becomes, the smaller the point number to be displayed becomes stepwise". The Examiner answers that Applicant's specification page 19, lines 15-20 teach that "that the total number of points which can be displayed on a banner advertisement is determined in accordance with an investment amount of an advertisement sponsor". Also, Applicant's specification page 36, lines 5-15 teach that "if the user displays the same banner advertisement many times, then the displayed point (namely, gained point number) is gradually decreased. Then the decreased points of the displayed points with respect to this user is allocated to other user, so the points which are provided by the same advertisement sponsor may be widely applied to many users". Golhaber teaches displaying a cybercoin banner ad which indicates to users an amount of compensation to be given to said user for interacting with said ads (see col 11, lines 10-20); preventing consumer from receiving additional compensation by merely successively viewing the same ad (see col 17, lines 53-57). Gardenswartz teaches that users that continue with interact or comply with an ad are offered decreasingly lower awards (see col 18, lines 1-5) and Bachman teaches that incentive points cost money and sponsors need to put a cap in the amount of incentive points given to customers (see col 10, lines 1-10). Therefore, Goldhaber would be motivated to display decreasingly lower cybercoins awards to user that repeatedly interact (i.e. comply) with the same ad, as taught by Gardenswartz in view that awards cost money as taught by Bachman and therefore, said money needs to be better allocated to users that have not previously interacted with a particular ad in order to motivate new users to interact with said ad.